

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 2. This sheet, which includes Figures 1 and 2, replaces the original sheet including Figures 1 and 2.

In Figure 2, reference numerals and leader lines are added consistent with Figure 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance. This amendment is submitted as part of a Request for Continued Examination ("RCE").

The indication on page 4 of the Official Action that the previously cited references seem to be deficient in precluding issuance of the amended and newly presented claims is acknowledged.

Declaration

Although not believed to be necessary, a declaration under 37 CFR 1.67, containing a supplemental oath or declaration, is appended to this amendment responsive to the requirement presented by the Official Action.

Amendments to the Application

Figure 2 is amended to provide reference numerals and leader lines consistent with Figure 1. The amendment to Figure 2 is supported in the specification (e.g., page 6, lines 18-25) and Figure 1 as originally filed, and does not introduce new matter.

Claims 4-5 and 9-10 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 2 and 8 are amended, as below, to overcome the Official Action's rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The amendments to the claims do not introduce new matter.

Formal Issues - Section 112, second paragraph

The Official Action rejected claims 2 and 8-10 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Official Action objected to the

use of the reference numerals stating that they are not commensurate through the claim and do not correspond to the drawings.

In response, the recitation in claims 2 and 8 of an outlet deflector is amended to include reference numeral (3) in place of (2). The amendment finds support in the specification and the drawing figures as originally filed (e.g., page 6, lines 18-25; Figure 1).

Claim 8 is further amended to remove the term "inlet" in order to recite the invention in a manner more consistent with the specification and the drawing figures as originally filed.

The Official Action further states that the recitation "formed exclusively of a same plastic material" in claim 8 is indefinite for having more than one possible interpretation, relevant to the references previously cited.

In particular, the Official Action stated that the claim is unclear as to whether each of the deflectors and mobile equipment are "made of the same plastic material" or additionally if they are "only made of plastic".

In response, claim 8 is amended, based on the comments of the Official Action, to recite that a first deflector (1), a second deflector (3), and a mono-block mobile equipment are made of a same plastic material and made only of the same plastic material.

The amendment finds support in the specification and the claims as originally filed. For example, claim 1, as originally filed, recited a small dimension throwaway turbine device... characterized in only three components realized in one single printing and injection production phase out of plastic material, making use of always the same raw material (emphasis added). Claim 1, as originally filed, further describes that the mobile equipment or blade, out of plastic material, consists of one single piece (emphasis added).

Further, the specification, as originally filed, discloses these same characteristics and features recited at page 6, lines 18-25, and further contrasts the present invention from the prior art at page 7, lines 1-5 in that "different raw materials are used," whereas the present invention is advantageous over the prior art because it makes "use of one single, low cost raw material," (page 1, line 9).

Based on these disclosures, it is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendment to claim 8 is fully supported by the specification as originally filed. The single printing and injection, always of the same raw material, necessarily yields a product formed only of said same raw material and from said same raw material. Therefore, claim 8 recites no new matter in reciting that the three components, the first deflector (1), the second deflector (3), and the mono-block

mobile equipment are made of a same plastic material and made only of the same plastic material (emphasis added).

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is earnestly requested.

Formal Issues - Section 112, first paragraph

The Official Action rejected claims 1-10 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, stating that the claims fail to comply with the written description requirement.

The Official Action states that the claims contain subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one of skill that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. The Official Action states that the amendment to claim 1 to include the word "exclusively" with respect to the plastic material is not disclosed in the original specification. The Official Action further states that no support is found with respect to the inlet deflector and the outlet deflector formed "exclusively" of the plastic material of which the mobile equipment is formed.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The original specification, including the claims originally filed, clearly discloses a negative limitation in its use, for example, of the words "single", "consisting of only", "one single" and "always the same" (e.g., page 1, line 9; page 6, lines 18-25).

For example, page 6 of the specification, beginning at line 18, discloses that the drawing figures illustrate a small

dimension turbine device "consisting of only three components realized in one single printing and injection production phase, making use of always the same raw material."

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing disclosure supports a claim of a mono-block mobile equipment formed exclusively of a plastic material, and of an inlet deflector and an outlet deflector formed exclusively of the plastic material, as recited in claim 1. That is, the disclosure at page 6, lines 18-25 clearly discloses a single raw material realized on one single printing and injection production phase, hence excluding the introduction of any other raw material to distinguish the material forming any of the three parts.

The specification further qualifies this disclosure by drawing comparison to the prior art. The prior art, for example, uses "different raw materials" and "other components like semi-precious stones of watchmaking," (page 7, lines 8-12) required to support the operating requirements (e.g., 1000 revolutions per second) of the device (page 3, lines 1-12). The present invention is disclosed to overcome the problems of the prior art "without any other components like semi-precious stones of watchmaking," (page 7, lines 11-12). The inventive structure thus provides advantages in avoiding deterioration in performance due to friction between the coupling surfaces of the rotation axis, (page 8, lines 7-10).

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1, as presently presented, is fully supported by the specification as originally filed in full, clear, concise, and exact terms such as to enable any person skilled in the art or most nearly connected art to make and use the invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is compliant with the first paragraph of 35 USC 112.

If an alternative term, such as "only" would be more acceptable, Applicant would be willing to consider substituting the term "exclusively" in claim 1 with the term "only", as Applicant is of the opinion that these terms, in the context of the claim, are synonymous.

It is also respectfully submitted that claim 8, as amended, is fully supported at least by the disclosures in the specification cited above and with respect to the specification passages cited in regards to the foregoing rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 8 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

It is further respectfully submitted that the claims, as presented, are novel and non-obvious over the references previously cited in the instant application. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims, as presented, are in allowable condition.

From the foregoing, it will be apparent that Applicant has fully responded to the March 24, 2009 Official Action and that the claims as presented are patentable. In view of this, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims, as presented, and their early passage to issue.

In order to expedite the prosecution of this case, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the attorney for Applicant at the number set forth below if the Examiner is of the opinion that further discussion of this case would be helpful.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Jeremy G. Mereness/  
Jeremy G. Mereness, Reg. No. 63,422  
209 Madison Street  
Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JGM/fb



**APPENDIX:**

The Appendix includes the following item(s):

- ☒ - a 37 CFR 1.67 Declaration
- ☒ - a Replacement Sheet for Figures 1-2 of the drawings